R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 422 AC 001 265

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ESTABLISHING CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION OF PROPOSALS OF THE COUNCIL OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS.

BY- JOHNSON, BEN F. AND OTHERS
GEORGIA UNIV., ATHENS

PUB DATE JUN 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.68 17P.

DESCRIPTORS- *UNIVERSITY EXTENSION, *PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, *PROGRAM PROPOSALS, *CRITERIA, *EVALUATION, FEDERAL LEGISLATION, HIGHER EDUCATION, STATE STANDARDS, PROGRAM PLANNING, COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, ADVISORY COMMITTEES, ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS, EDUCATIONAL NEEDS, EDUCATIONAL FINANCE, RATING SCALES, GUIDELINES, ATHENS, GEORGIA, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 TITLE I

THE "COMMITTEE FOR ESTABLISHING CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION OF PROPOSALS" IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA, ADVISED THE CREATION OF A "PROPOSAL REVIEW COMMITTEE" TO ASSESS THE MERITS OF NEW UNIVERSITY EXTENSION PROJECTS, PROPOSED FOR FUNDING UNDER TITLE I, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, PRIOR TO KNOWLEDGE OF AVAILABLE FUNDS, TO ACCOMODATE THESE PROPOSALS TO THE AMOUNTS ACTUALLY FUNDED, AND TO CONDUCT GENERAL EVALUATION AND LIAISON. GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR FUNDING UNDER TITLE I CALLED FOR NONCREDIT PROGRAMS OF ADULT INSTRUCTION, AT COLLEGE LEVEL OR ABOVE, TO BE CONDUCTED BY QUALIFIED INSTITUTIONS WITHIN THE SCOPE, OBJECTIVES, AND CRITERIA OF THE GEORGIA STATE PLAN. SPECIFIC PROGRAM CRITERIA WERE--(1) AN ADEQUATE SUMMARY STATEMENT, (2) A LEGITIMATE PROBLEM, (3) SIGNIFICANT AND REALISTIC OBJECTIVES, (4) SERVICE TO THE RIGHT TARGET AUDIENCE, (5) APPROPRIATE STAFF FOR PROJECT PLANNING, EXECUTION, AND EVALUATION, (6) AN EDUCATIONALLY SOUND PLAN OF EXECUTION, (7) ATTENTION TO GENUINE COMMUNITY NEEDS RATHER THAN TO INSTITUTIONAL NEEDS, (8) PARTICIPATION BY THE COMMUNITY IN PLANNING PROGRAM, (9) REAL POTENTIAL FOR CONTINUING BENEFITS TO THE WIDER PUBLIC, (10) A SOUND AND REALISTIC BUDGET, (11) PROVISION FOR EFFECTIVE POSTPROJECT EVALUATION, AND (12) A PLAN FOR DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ON PROJECT METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS TO INTERESTED GROUPS AND INSTITUTIONS. THE DOCUMENT INCLUDED AN EVALUATION CHECKLIST. (LY)

ED012422

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Eric Central

JUN 19 1967

REPORT OF

THE COMMITTEE FOR ESTABLISHING CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION OF PROPOSALS OF THE COUNCIL OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Adopted June 6, 1967

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965

Georgia Community Continuing Education Service
State Agency : University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

AC 001265

REPORT

COMMITTEE FOR ESTABLISHING CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR SELECTION OF PROPOSALS

On September 22, 1966, the Council of Participating Institutions authorized the appointment of a Committee for Establishing Criteria and Procedures for Selection of Proposals. Subsequently this Committee was appointed as follows:

Dean Ben F. Johnson (Chairman) - Emory University
President Louis Alderman - Middle Georgia College
Dr. W. R. Brown - University of Georgia
Mr. Bob Herndon - Georgia Institute of Technology
Dr. Prince Jackson - Savannah State College
Mr. John Lipscomb - Berry College

The Committee held meetings as follows:

January 21, 1967
February 11, 1967
February 25, 1967
June 5, 1967

At the meeting on January 21, 1967, the Committee considered the advisability of a Review Committee to review proposals and advise the State Agency with respect thereto. In this connection the following extract from its minutes is appropriate:

"On the question of the advisability of a review committee to review proposals and advise the State Agency, the consensus of the Committee was that the Council of Participating Institutions should establish a Proposal Review Committee to review proposals and make recommendations to the State Agency. It was felt that this Review Committee should also stand in some relation to the Committee for Establishing Criteria and Procedures. In this position it would serve to inject an element of checks and balances, objectivity, and openness into the selection procedure; it would also serve as a means of communication between the State Agency and the Committee for

Establishing Criteria with respect to the volume and quality of proposals, information useful in criticizing existing and prospective criteria, and other data from which to determine whether existing or proposed criteria operated or would operate to involve an appropriate variety of viewpoints concerning the subject matters of continuing education.

"It was the consensus of the Committee that the Review Committee should perform two reviews: a general review of proposals in terms of their respective merit prior to knowledge of available funding, and a special review to accommodate the various proposals to the amount of funding available when it is known.

"The Committee anticipated that the work of the Review Committee would be carried out in the following manner. First, the State Agency would preliminarily classify all proposals according to the following scheme:

1. Illegitimate
   (a) in terms of the scope of Title I
   (b) in terms of established criteria

2. Borderline
   (a) in terms of established criteria
   (b) in terms of relative merit

3. Legitimate
   (a) in terms of established criteria
   (b) in terms of relative merit

Conceivably the Review Committee might furnish the State Agency with more specific instructions to regulate its initial screening. In any event, properly classified, all proposals would be placed at the disposal of the Review Committee; it would proceed with its general review and later its special review to the point of making specific recommendations to the State Agency both of proposals and grant awards.

"It was contemplated too that the Proposal Review Committee would perform an evaluation function of (1) the initial screening performed by the State Agency and (2) the final actions of the State Agency viz a viz the recommendations of the Proposal Review Committee, these evaluations to be communicated to the Council of Participating Institutions. It was taken as implicit that the Proposal Review Committee would also perform a function of self-evaluation.

"It was the consensus of the Committee that members of the Proposal Review Committee should be appointed by the Council of Participating

Institutions, that the appointment should be of persons and not institutions and that appointments should be for one year and vacancies filled by additional appointments of the Council for the unexpired term involved in a particular vacancy. It was the further consensus that initially the Proposal Review Committee should consist of 15 members: the six members of the Committee for Establishing Criteria and Procedures, the chairman of the Council's Committee on Inter-Institutional Relationships, the chairman of the Council's Committee on State Agency Services, the chairman of the Council's Committee on Planning of Area and Statewide Conferences, and six other persons. It was agreed that in determining appointees to this committee the Council should seek a balance in the representation of viewpoints of the participating institutions. It was agreed further that each member of the Proposal Review Committee should be the designated representative of an actively participating institution, but not necessarily a member of the Council of Participating Institutions."

In its subsequent meetings the Committee formulated a statement of guidelines for use by institutions preparing proposals to be submitted for funding under Title I of The Higher Education Act of 1965 and a form for the evaluation of such proposals. These are attached hereto and submitted for the consideration of the Council.

GUIDELINES FOR PROPOSALS

FOR FUNDING UNDER TITLE I, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

General

To receive consideration for funding, proposals submitted to the State Agency must meet the provisions of Title I as well as of the current Georgia State Plan. Briefly it is required that an acceptable program must be

(a). an instructional program

(b). Of adult education

(c). At least of college level

(d). Of a non-credit character

(e). Within the scope and objectives prescribed in the current State Plan

(f). Within the criteria prescribed for the current State Plan

(g). By an institution qualified under the State Plan

A proposal of <u>outstanding</u> merit involving academic credit may nevertheless be considered notwithstanding the general requirement that an acceptable proposal be of a non-credit character.

Every proposed program should, within the two-year period allowable under the State Plan, achieve a degree of completion commensurate with its funding, and any phasing beyond that time should be considered as a separate and self-contained proposal and be judged on its own merit in competition with other proposals under current consideration.

Proposals meeting the above qualifications will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set forth below, and priority in funding will go to the proposals receiving the highest evaluation. It is not expected that each proposal will meet each criterion completely, and certainly some of the sub-topics will not be applicable to every proposal.

By way of an introductory summary the following are, in general, the criteria contemplated:

(a). Brief general description of the project

(b). Identification of the problem

(c). Statement of objectives

(d). Expected participation

(e). Indication of staff involvement

(f). Plan of execution

(g). Evidence of institutional capability

(h). Evidence of community involvement

(i). Explanation of expected continuing benefits

(j). Budget information

(k). Plan for post-project evaluation

(l). Certificate of institutional assurance

Specific Criteria

1. Does the proposal contain an introductory statement adequately describing the proposed project in broad and <u>general</u> terms (perhaps one brief paragraph)?

a. Nature of the project (workshop, seminar, lecture series, etc.)

b. Subject matter in broad general terms

c. Target audience in broad general terms

d. Proposed timing of project in general terms

2. Is the problem one which should be attacked under this program?

a. Consistent with the purposes set forth in Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and in the Georgia State Plan

b. Significant in terms of the opportunity for rendering an educational service

c. Urgent from the standpoint of its need for immediate solution or attack

d. Not susceptible to easier solution by other means

3. Are the objectives significant and realistic?

a. Stated in specific terms

b. Expected immediate results indicated

c. Expected long-term results indicated

4. Will the proposed program involve the right target audience?

a. Aimed at those persons (community or communities) who need this kind of program

b. Reasonable assurance given that the stated target audience will be reached

5. Does the proposal provide for the involvement of the appropriate staff in the planning, execution, and evaluation of the program?

a. Administrative personnel of principal institution

b. Appropriate faculty of principal institution

c. Staff of cooperating institutions and/or agencies

6. Is the plan of execution educationally sound?

a. One person designated as director or coordinator

b. Subject matter specified

c. Schedule set forth (number, length, frequency of sessions, approximate starting date and approximate ending date)

7. What is the capability of the institution for carrying out the proposed project?

a. Degree of interest on part of administration and faculty (president, department head (s) or appropriate faculty members)

b. Qualifications of proposed faculty in the problem area (availability of qualified supplementary faculty, if required)

c. Institution's experience in dealing with this problem and/or other community projects

d. Institution's experience in planning and conducting special education programs

e. Facilities for conducting the program

8. Does the proposed program meet a real community service need rather than an institutional need? *

a. Focus upon community problem (s) and need (s)

b. Community need (s) documented

c. Program designed specifically to meet the identified need (s)

---

* A point stressed again and again by Mr. Paul Delker at a recent N.U.E.A. Conference, University of Michigan, April 22-25, 1967.

9. To what extent does the proposed program involve participation by the community to be served in planning, execution, and evaluation?
   a. Leaders of appropriate community groups involved in preliminary planning
   b. All groups represented in study and execution of program
   c. All groups represented in evaluation
10. Does the proposed program have real potential for continuing benefits to the community and/or the state?
   a. In terms of demonstration of methodology that may be utilized elsewhere
   b. In terms of multiplier effect - e.g., persons who are trained may themselves organize and conduct similar programs in other sections of the state
   c. In terms of providing a base upon which to build other programs or serving as a catalyst to trigger additional programs
11. Is the proposed budget realistic and economically sound?
   a. In terms of dollars per student hour
   b. In terms of dollars per instructor hour
   c. In terms of expected community benefits
12. Is there a realistic provision for post-project evaluation?
   a. Method of evaluation
   b. Measures to be applied
   c. Schedule for evaluation
   d. Plan for reporting results

13. Does the proposal provide for communicating information about the methodology and results of the program to other interested institutions and groups?*

    a. Needs for disseminating information

    b. Plans for disseminating information

---

* If it appears that the information gathered, the results obtained, and the program summary may be of considerable value to other institutions or groups, plans for dissemination of this information should be included in the proposal.

On the other hand, if the anticipated results of conducting a given program would appear to have little or no significant value for other institutions' continuing education programs, it would not be expected that plans for communicating results be made a part of the proposal.

EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

FOR FUNDING UNDER TITLE I, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

General

To receive consideration for funding, proposals submitted to the State Agency must meet the provisions of Title I as well as of the current Georgia State Plan. Briefly it is required that an acceptable program must be

_____ (a) an instructional program

_____ (b) of adult education

_____ (c) at least of college level

_____ (d) of a non-credit character

_____ (e) within the scope and objectives prescribed in the current State Plan

_____ (f) within the criteria prescribed for the current State Plan

_____ (g) by an institution qualified under the State Plan

Specific Criteria

1. DOES THE PROPOSAL CONTAIN AN INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT ADEQUATELY DESCRIBING THE PROPOSED PROJECT IN BROAD AND GENERAL TERMS (PERHAPS ONE BRIEF PARAGRAPH)? *

4	3	2	1	0

   a. Nature of the project (workshop, seminar, lecture series, etc.)

   b. Subject matter in broad general terms

   c. Target audience in broad general terms

---

*Rating scale values arranged in descending order. Place check mark ( ) in square that comes nearest to indicating value merited by given proposal taking all factors into consideration.

d. Proposed timing of project in general terms

2. IS THE PROBLEM ONE WHICH SHOULD BE ATTACKED UNDER THIS PROGRAM?

4	3	2	1	0

a. Consistent with the purposes set forth in Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and in the Georgia State Plan

b. Significant in terms of the opportunity for rendering an educational service

c. Urgent from the standpoint of its need for immediate solution or attack

d. Not susceptible to easier solution by other means

3. ARE THE OBJECTIVES SIGNIFICANT AND REALISTIC?

4	3	2	1	0

a. Stated in specific terms

b. Expected immediate results indicated

c. Expected long-term results indicated

4. WILL THE PROPOSED PROGRAM INVOLVE THE RIGHT TARGET AUDIENCE?

4	3	2	1	0

a. Aimed at those persons (community or communities) who need this kind of program

b. Reasonable assurance given that the stated target audience will be reached

5. DOES THE PROPOSAL PROVIDE FOR THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATE STAFF IN THE PLANNING, EXECUTION, AND EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM?

4	3	2	1	0

a. Administrative personnel of principal institution

b. Appropriate faculty of principal institution

c. Staff of cooperating institutions and/or agencies

6. IS THE PLAN OF EXECUTION EDUCATIONALLY SOUND?

4	3	2	1	0

a. One person designated as director or coordinator

b. Subject matter specified

d. Schedule set forth (number, length, frequency of sessions, approximate starting date and approximate ending date)

7. WHAT IS THE CAPABILITY OF THE INSTITUTION FOR CARRYING OUT THE PROPOSED PROJECT?

4	3	2	1	0

a. Degree of interest on part of administration and faculty (president, department head(s) or appropriate faculty members)

b. Qualifications of proposed faculty in the problem area (availability of qualified supplementary faculty, if required)

c. Institution's experience in dealing with this problem and/or other community projects

d. Institution's experience in planning and conducting special educational programs

e. Facilities for conducting the program

8. DOES THE PROPOSED PROGRAM MEET A REAL COMMUNITY SERVICE NEED RATHER THAN AN INSTITUTIONAL NEED?*

4	3	2	1	0

a. Focus upon community problem(s) and need(s)

b. Community need(s) documented

c. Program designed specifically to meet the identified need(s)

9. TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE PROPOSED PROGRAM INVOLVE PARTICIPATION BY THE COMMUNITY TO BE SERVED IN PLANNING, EXECUTION, AND EVALUATION?

4	3	2	1	0

a. Leaders of appropriate community groups involved in preliminary planning

b. All groups represented in study and execution of program

c. All groups represented in evaluation

10. DOES THE PROPOSED PROGRAM HAVE REAL POTENTIAL FOR CONTINUING BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY AND/OR THE STATE?

4	3	2	1	0

a. In terms of demonstration of methodology that may be utilized elsewhere

b. In terms of multiplier effect - e.g., persons who are trained may themselves organize and conduct similar programs in other sections of the state

c. In terms of providing a base upon which to build other programs or serving as a catalyst to trigger additional programs

---

*A point stressed again and again by Mr. Paul Belker at recent N.U.E.A. Conference at University of Michigan, April 22-25, 1967.

11. IS THE PROPOSED BUDGET REALISTIC AND ECONOMICALLY SOUND?

4	3	2	1	0

a. In terms of dollars per student hour

b. In terms of dollars per instructor hour

c. In terms of expected community benefits

12. IS THERE A REALISTIC PROVISION FOR POST-PROJECT EVALUATION?

4	3	2	1	0

a. Method of evaluation

b. Measures to be applied

c. Schedule for evaluation

d. Plan for reporting results

13. DOES THE PROPOSAL PROVIDE FOR COMMUNICATING INFORMATION ABOUT THE METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS OF THE PROGRAM TO OTHER INTERESTED INSTITUTIONS AND GROUPS?*

4	3	2	1	0

a. Needs for disseminating information

b. Plans for disseminating information

---

*If the anticipated results of conducting a given program would appear to have little or no significant value for other institutions' continuing education programs, it would not be expected that plans for communicating results be made a part of the proposal. In such cases criterion 13 would simply be ignored.

THE LIBRARY OF
OCT 6 1967
CONTINUING EDUCATION